



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
DW Feb-06

EDWARD L. BISHOP
FACTOR & LAKE, LTD
1327 W. WASHINGTON BLVD., SUITE 5 G/H
CHICAGO IL 60607

COPY MAILED
FEB 23 2006
OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Raymond A. Liberatore :
Application No. 10/810,485 : DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: 26 March, 2004 :
For: SPREADER :
:

This is a decision on the petition filed on 29 July, 2005, under 37 CFR 1.137(b),¹ to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is GRANTED.

The application became abandoned on 9 August, 2004, for failure to timely reply to the Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application mailed on 8 June, 2004, which set a two (2) month shortened period for reply. No extensions of time

¹ Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continuing examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application, abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

under 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 17 February, 2005.

Petitioners have filed the statutory basic filing fee, an executed declaration under 37 CFR 1.63, the late-filing surcharge, and an abstract of the technical disclosure as required by the Notice mailed on 8 June, 2004.

The statement contained in the instant petition does not set forth that the entire delay from the due date of the required reply to the date of the filing of a grantable petition was unintentional as required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3). However, the statement contained in the instant petition is being so construed. Petitioner **must** notify the Office if this is not a correct interpretation.

This application is being referred to the Office of Initial Patent Examination for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions